

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
OXFORD DIVISION**

ESTATE OF PAMELA KAY WILLIAMS, et al.

PLAINTIFFS

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:17-CV-253-MPM-RP

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DEFENDANT

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO SEAL

Before the Court is the defendant's motion to seal Exhibits 112-2 and 112-10.

Docket 114. The Court, having considered the motion, finds that it is well-taken and should be granted.


Defendant has represented to the court that Exhibits 112-2 and 112-10 filed with its Motion to Dismiss contains Ms. Williams' personal identifying information.

Local Rule 79(b) specifies that "any order sealing a document must include particularized findings demonstrating that seal is support by clear and compelling reasons and is narrowly tailored to serve those reasons." L.U. Civ. R. 79(b). To determine whether to allow the sealing of a requested document, "the court must balance the public's common law right of access against the interests of favoring nondisclosure." *SEC v. Van Waeyenberghe*, 990 F.2d 845, 848 (5th Cir. 1993).

Upon weighing the competing interests, the undersigned finds that the Defendant has provided clear and compelling reasons for sealing Exhibits 112-2 and 112-10. The request is narrowly tailored because the public will have access to the remainder of the docket except these two particular exhibits.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED, that the clerks' office is directed to seal exhibit 112-2 and 112-10.

SO ORDERED, this the 22nd day of February 2021.



United States District Judge